UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/792,371	03/03/2004	Rance A. Kirtley	1209-45	4236
2000	7590 · 04/23/2007 & BARON, LLP		EXAMINER	
6900 JERICHO	TURNPIKE		RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR	
SYOSSET, NY 11791			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/792,371	KIRTLEY ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Melur Ramakrishnaiah	2614			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 March 2004</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 						
Dispositi	Disposition of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) 11-16 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner is/are: a) acceptable and acceptable and acceptable accept	relection requirement.	Fxaminer			
 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 3-3-2004.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te			

Application/Control Number: 10/792,371

Art Unit: 2614

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elman et al. (US PAT: 7,143,152, filed 3-31-2000) in view of Manthoulis et al. (US PAT: 6,963,542, filed 1-15-2003, hereinafter Manthoulis).

Regarding claim 1, Elman discloses the following: in a telecommunication network having at least one operation support system, the method for automatic provisioning and maintenance of the operation support systems, the method comprising: receiving from at least one operating support system (reads on 102, 108, fig. 1) a request related to network elements of at least one EMS client (106, fig. 1, creating a data set of detailed descriptions (as shown in 604, 606, fig. 6) based on request for each of the network elements using a database (116, fig. 1) and provisioning logic in (114, fig. 1), transmitting resulting data set to the operating support system which submitted the request (figs. 4-6, col. 8, line 22 – col. 9, line 29).

Elman differs from claim 1 in that he does not specifically teach: transmitting an asynchronous notification of the resulting data set to all operating support systems.

However, Manthoulis discloses web based capacity management system which teaches: transmitting an asynchronous notification of the resulting data (reads on particular threshold data) set to all operating support systems (col. 4 lines 35-42).

Application/Control Number: 10/792,371

Art Unit: 2614

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Elman's system to provide for the following: transmitting an asynchronous notification of the resulting data set to all operating support systems as this arrangement would provide means for efficiently managing network system as taught by Manthoulis.

Regarding claims 2-6, Elman further teaches the following: database (116, fig. 1) information on attributes associated with network elements as shown by items 604, 606 in fig. 6, selecting at least one of the network element attributes from the database based requerst received from the operating system (col. 9 lines 24-29), attributes include managed element, topological link, multilayer sub network, PTP, CTP, equipment holder, equipment, routing link, sub network connection etc as shown in figs. 5-6 (col. 8, line 63 – col. 9, line 29), request includes instructions to create a connection between EMS clients and notifying the connection to all the operating support systems (fig. 1; col. 4 lines 25-43).

Elman differs from claims 7-9 in that he does not specifically teach:
asynchronous notification is transmitted upon: creation of network elements, deletion of
network elements, change in the state of the network elements.

However, Manthoulis teaches the following: asynchronous notification is transmitted upon change in the state of the network elements (col. 4 lines 35-43).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Elman's system to provide for the following: asynchronous notification is transmitted upon: creation of network elements, deletion of

Application/Control Number: 10/792,371

Art Unit: 2614

network elements, change in the state of the network elements as this arrangement would provide means for efficiently managing network system as taught by Manthoulis.

3. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elman in view of Manthoulis as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sauriol et al. (US PAT: 7,206,825, filed 12-31-2001, hereinafter Sauriol).

The combination differs from claim 10 in that it does not teach: network elements simulate behavior of the EMS clients

However, Sauriol discloses system and method for network configuration engine which teaches: network elements simulate behavior of the EMS clients (fig. 3; col. 3 lines 33-52).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: network elements simulate behavior of the EMS clients as this arrangement would facilitate for modification or testing of various network elements as taught by Sauriol, thus contributing efficient network confifuration.

4. Claims 11-16 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Melur Ramakrishnaiah Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2614